

FORM 26. Docketing Statement

Form 26 (p. 1)
July 2020

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS FOR THE FEDERAL CIRCUIT

DOCKETING STATEMENT

Case Number: 23-1913

Short Case Caption: Xerox Corp. v. X Corp.

Filing Party/Entity: X Corp.

Instructions: Complete each section or check the box if a section is intentionally blank or not applicable. Attach additional pages as needed. Refer to the court's Mediation Guidelines for filing requirements. An amended docketing statement is required for each new appeal or cross-appeal consolidated after first filing.

Case Origin	Originating Number	Type of Case
PTAB	IPR2021-01398	Inter Partes Review

Relief sought on appeal: ☐ None/Not Applicable

Affirmance of determination that claims 1-18 of U.S. Patent No. 7,043,475 are unpatentable under 35 U.S.C. § 103.

Relief awarded below (if damages, specify): ☐ None/Not Applicable

The PTAB determined that Claims 1-18 of U.S. Patent No. 7,043,475 are unpatentable under 35 U.S.C. § 103.

Briefly describe the judgment/order appealed from:

PTAB final written decision determining that challenged claims 1-18 are unpatentable.

Nature of judgment (select one):

Date of judgment: 3/13/23

☒ Final Judgment, 28 USC § 1295☐ Rule 54(b)☐ Interlocutory Order (specify type) _____☐ Other (explain) _____

FORM 26. Docketing Statement

Form 26 (p. 2)
July 2020

Name and docket number of any related cases pending before this court, and the name of the writing judge if an opinion was issued. ☐ None/Not Applicable

Palo Alto Research Center, LLC v. Facebook, Inc., No. 23-1714 (Fed. Cir.)

Issues to be raised on appeal: ☐ None/Not Applicable

Whether substantial evidence supports the PTAB's conclusion that claims 1-18 are unpatentable under 35 U.S.C. § 103.

Have there been discussions with other parties relating to settlement of this case?

☒ Yes ☐ No

If "yes," when were the last such discussions?

- ☐ Before the case was filed below
☒ During the pendency of the case below
☐ Following the judgment/order appealed from

If "yes," were the settlement discussions mediated? ☐ Yes ☒ No

If they were mediated, by whom?

N/A

Do you believe that this case may be amenable to mediation? ☐ Yes ☒ No

Explain.

This case involves the validity of a patent, rather than a money judgment.

Provide any other information relevant to the inclusion of this case in the court's mediation program.

N/A

Date: 6/2/23 Signature: /s/ Debra J. McComas

Name: Debra J. McComas